

Remarks/Arguments

The Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the amendments made above and the arguments set forth below. Claims 1-45, 47-52, and 59-75 were pending. Within the previous Office Action, Claims 26-45, 47-52, 59, 60, 63-71, and 73-75 have been allowed, Claims 16-18 and 25 have been objected to, and Claims 1-25, 61, 62, and 72 have been rejected. Claims 46 and 53-58 were previously canceled. By way of the amendments made above, Claims 1 and 17 have been amended and Claims 14-16 have been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-13, 17-45, 47-52 and 59-75 are still pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 11, 12, 19, 20, 61, 62, and 72 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,313,694 to Riedel (“Riedel”) in view of Yu et al., “A Cryptographic File System Supporting Multi-Level Security” (“Yu”). Within the Office Action, Claims 6-8, 14, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riedel in view of Yu as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0005300 to Noble et al. (“Noble”). Within the Office Action, Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riedel in view of Yu as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Blaze, “A Cryptographic File System for Unix.” Within the Office Action, Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riedel in view of Yu, and further in view of Noble as applied to Claim 5, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,881 to Schrader et al. Within the Office Action, Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riedel in view of Yu as applied to Claim 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,727,206 to Fish et al.

Within the Office Action, it also stated that Claims 16-18 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By the above amendments, the independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of the objected to Claim 16 and the intervening Claims 14 and 15. By the above amendments, Claims 14-16 have been canceled. Accordingly, the independent Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-13, 17-25, 61, 62 and 72 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As explained above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Claims 2-13, 17-25, 61, 62 and 72 are all also allowable as depending on an allowable base claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

Within the Office Action, it is stated that Claims 26-45, 47-52, 59, 60, 63-71, and 73-75 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-13, 17-45, 47-52 and 59-75 are in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 so that any outstanding issues can be quickly and efficiently resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: March 24, 2010

By: /Jonathan O. Owens/

Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No.: 37,902
Attorneys for Applicants